UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,121	09/10/2003	Youssef Hamadi	305228.01	3556

22971 7590 03/11/2011

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER	
LAM, HUNG H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/11/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ntovar@microsoft.com
p5docket@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,121	HAMADI, YOUSSEF	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG H. LAM	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02/16/10*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9-16,19-30 and 37-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9-16,19-30 and 37-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendments, filed 11/29/10, have been entered and made of record. Claims 5, 7-9, 17-19, 28-29, 31-36 are canceled. Claim 43-51 are added.

In view of applicants amendment to claims 1-6, 9-16, 19-30, 38-42, 11-20 and 39-40, the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. 101 are hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/29/10 with respect to independent claims 1, 11, 21 and all other dependent claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the rejections of claims 1-6, 9-16, 19-30, 37-42 over He in view of Maynard, Applicants' representative argue that He fails to tech the requesting made over at least two channels, including a channel adapted for use by a cell phone and a channel adapted for use by a laptop computer. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. He teaches that RFID reader 12 and/or imaging engine 14 may be attached or integrated with a portable handheld computer, PDA or portable scanning system and may be incorporated as part of local area, cellular or wide area network to coordinate scanning

and other image processing function. ([0028-0029; 0031]). Therefore, He still read on the amended claim.

Regarding independent claims 11 and 21, Applicants' representative argue He fails to disclose "wherein the sub-portion of the library includes a hierarchy of models, the hierarchy of models including a base model to roughly identify an object and specialized models to refine the rough identification". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. According to He, the stored image data 605 preferably includes one or more image entries 606 such that an entry of each side, view, face, front, back of the object and that these image entries 606 may include addition data indicative of object dimension, text identifying the object, face of the object and extractions or derivation data derived or extracted from the actual image data ([0052-0053]). Therefore, the base model is interpreted as one of the image entries of a particular side and the specialized models are interpreted as all other remained image entries and addition data indicative of object. Thus He reference still read on the amended claim 11 and 21.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 43, 49 and all other dependent claims have been fully considered and are moot in view of new ground of rejection.

In view of the above, the Examiner believes that the broadest interpretation of the present claimed invention does in fact read on the cited reference for at least the reasons discussed above and as stated in the detail Office Action as follows. This Office action is now made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 43 and 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over He (US-2004/0,118,916).

With regarding claim 43, He discloses a method comprising:

capturing an image (Figs. 1-2: See imaging engine 14);

transmitting a request for identification, the transmitting made over at least two channels, the at least two channels being different channels ([0029-0033]);

receiving, in response to the request for identification, a response from two or more objects, including a response from at least one object not actually in the image (He's scanner structure inherently encompass this claim limitation because if two

objects with the same RFID range are respond, one object is located within the field of view of camera 14 and other is outside the field of view of camera 14);

extracting, from a model data store, models associated with the response, the extracting including relevant models and excluding other models ([0024; 0038-0039; 0050-0054; 0056-0060]);

evaluating the image, using the extracted relevant models, to determine objects within the image ([0052-0054; 0056-0060]); and

However, He fails to explicitly disclose annotating the image with parameters for objects found in the image.

Official Notice is taken that it is well known and expected in the art to annotate more descriptive text to a captured image or object during image editing process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of He to include annotating capability to a scanner. The modifications thus provide more user friendly scanner.

With regarding claim 45, He discloses the method of claim 43, wherein extracting relevant models comprises extracting only models related to indoor objects or extracting only models related to outdoor objects ([0038; 0052]).

With regarding claim 46, He discloses the method of claim 43, wherein extracting relevant models comprises extracting a hierarchy of models, the hierarchy of models including a base model to roughly identify an object and specialized models to refine the rough identification ([0052-0053]: He teaches that the stored image data 605 preferably includes one or more image entries 606 such that an entry of each side, view, face, front, back of the object and that these image entries 606 may include addition data indicative of object dimension, text identifying the object, face of the object and extractions or derivation data derived or extracted from the actual image data. Therefore, the base model is interpreted as one of the image entries of a particular side and the specialized models are interpreted as all other remained image entries and addition data indicative of object).

With regarding claim 47, He fails to explicitly disclose the method of claim 43, wherein extracting models includes extracting parameterized models, the parameterized models distinguishing an open laptop from a closed laptop.

However, He teaches that object may be imaged from one or more angles for obtain image data corresponding to various sides, views, or faces of the object for providing more reliable verification results ([0038]) and stored image data entries 606 includes each side view, face, major faces, front, back, dimension, description or objects ([0052]). In light of the teaching from He, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of He to

further include other faces or angle for distinguishing open or closed status of an object. The modifications thus provide a more reliable and accurate verification results.

With regarding claim 48, He fails to explicitly disclose the method of claim 43, wherein extracting relevant models comprises extracting a sub-portion of models from the model data store based on brand of manufacturer.

However, He teaches stored image data entries 606 includes each side view, face, major faces, front, back, dimension, description of objects, quantitative or qualitative data derived or extracted from actual image data ([0052]). In light of the teaching from He, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of He to provide description of brand of manufacture of object. The modifications thus provide a more versatile scanner system.

With regarding claim 49, He method comprising:

capturing an image (Figs. 1-2: See imaging engine 14);

transmitting a request for identification, the transmitting made over at least two channels, including a channel adapted for use by a cell phone and a channel adapted for use by a laptop computer ([0029-0033]);

receiving, in response to the request for identification, a response from two or more objects, including a response from at least one object not actually in the image (He's scanner structure inherently encompass this claim limitation because if two objects with the same RFID range are respond, one object is located within the field of view of camera 14 and other is outside the field of view of camera 14);

extracting, from a model data store, models associated with the response, the extracting including relevant models and excluding non-relevant models ([0024; 0038-0039; 0050-0054; 0056-0060]); the extracting including:

extracting only models related to indoor objects or extracting only models related to outdoor objects ([0038; 0052]);

extracting a hierarchy of models, the hierarchy of models including a base model to roughly identify an object and specialized models to refine the rough identification ([0052-0053]: He teaches that the stored image data 605 preferably includes one or more image entries 606 such that an entry of each side, view, face, front, back of the object and that these image entries 606 may include addition data indicative of object dimension, text identifying the object, face of the object and extractions or derivation data derived or extracted from the actual image data. Therefore, the base model is interpreted as one of the image entries of a particular side and the specialized models are interpreted as all other remained image entries and addition data indicative of object);

He fails to explicitly disclose extracting parameterized models, the parameterized models distinguishing an open laptop from a closed laptop.

However, He teaches that object may be imaged from one or more angles for obtain image data corresponding to various sides, views, or faces of the object for providing more reliable verification results ([0038]) and stored image data entries 606 includes each side view, face, major faces, front, back, dimension, description or objects ([0052]). In light of the teaching from He, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of He to further include other faces or angle for distinguishing open or closed status of an object. The modifications thus provide a more reliable and accurate verification results.

He fails to explicitly disclose extracting a sub-portion of models from the model data store based on brand of manufacturer.

However, He teaches stored image data entries 606 includes each side view, face, major faces, front, back, dimension, description of objects, quantitative or qualitative data derived or extracted from actual image data ([0052]). In light of the teaching from He, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of He to provide description of brand of manufacture of object. The modifications thus provide a more versatile scanner system.

evaluating the image, using the extracted relevant models, to determine objects within the image ([0050-0061]).

6. Claims 1-4, 6, 10-16, 20-27, 30, 37-42 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over He in view of Maynard (US-5949335).

With regarding **claim 1**, He discloses a method comprising:

requesting identification of a first object in association with a capture of an image (Fig. 2; RFID block; abstract; [0010-0011; 0027-0029; 0032-0033);

the requesting made over at least two channels, including a channel adapted for use by a cell phone and a channel adapted for use by a laptop computer ([0028-0029; 0031]);

receiving a first identifier, responsive to the requesting operation, the first identifier identifying the first object in the image ([0029-0033]).

However, He fails to explicitly disclose selecting, based on the first identifier, a sub-portion of a library of potential matches.

identifying a second object that is shown in the image separately from the first object using the sub-portion of the potential matches, the second object being identified by a second identifier that is different from the first identifier.

In the same field of endeavor, Maynard teaches an RFID tagging system having RFID tag that can be program to write different sets of data thereto Col. 1, Ln. 50-51). The RFID or transponder tag includes a first storage area for storing a first set of data uniquely identifying the transponder tag and a second storage area for storing a second set of data describing an asset and components within said asset (Fig. 3; see tag data

and asset data; abstract; Col. 1, Ln. 53-57; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60; Col. 6, Ln. 21-Col. 7, Ln. 10). Maynard further teaches computer network assets include processor, workstation, monitors, printers, scanners, network servers and the components include hard drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems, and all other equipments which can be sold within or added to a network asset (Col. 1, Ln. 59-65: Therefore, sold/ added equipments or components such that external hard drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems are encompassed by Maynard reference). Maynard further suggested that the printers, and scanners of such kinds of assets can also be supplied with transponder tags and EEPROM's (Col. 6, Ln. 40-41; sold/ added equipments or components and printers, scanners are inherently separated from computer network asset shown in Fig. 1). In light of the teaching from Maynard, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of He to include a second storage in an RFID tag in order to store information describing a plurality of external components such that external drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems and/or any other equipments and thus allow He's device to further select one of the plurality of data described in the second storage area of the RFID to identify other external components or sold/ added equipments (second object) that are attached to a computer network asset (first object). The modifications not only allow a single RFID tag to store information of all other objects/ external components or added/sold equipments that are added to a first object (computer network asset), but also allow the device to further identify all other objects/ external components or added/sold equipments surrounding a computer network asset.

He as modified by Maynard teaches wherein the sub-portion is less than the library of potential matches (The limitation is broadly written and confused. Therefore, the examiner broadly interpreted this limitation as if searching by the sub-portion is less time than by searching for a whole library of potential matches. Col. 1, Ln. 53-65; Col. 6, Ln. 21-Col. 7, Ln. 10: Maynard teaches a second storage of the tag for describing the asset and its components or equipments. [0024]: He teaches to determine if the image data generated by the imaging engine corresponds with stored image data associated with the read RFID code. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the device o He to only limit a search to only images data associated with read RFID code including in a first and second storage RFID tag area of Maynard in order to reduce search time).

With regarding **claim 2**, He discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the first object is an active object, and the identifier of the active object is received from the active object (abstract; [0029-0033]: object inherently active in order for the RFID block to activate the object for receiving RFID signals).

With regarding **claim 3**, He discloses the method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the objects is a delegate object, and wherein the identifier of the delegate object is received from another object (abstract; [0005-0007]; Maynard: Fig. 3: see tag data and asset data ; [abstract; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60]).

With regarding **claim 4**, He discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising: capturing the image, wherein an image capture device performs the requesting, receiving, and capturing operations (Figs. 2-3; imaging 14; abstract; [0012; 0025; 0039; 0044]).

With regarding **claim 6**, He discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising: extracting a model associated with the identifier from a model library (Fig. 6; extract data module 616 and/or comparator module 608; abstract; [0056-0058]; Maynard: [abstract; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60]).

With regarding **claim 10**, He discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising: associatively storing with the image one or more parameters relating to the object identified in the image ([0005-0008; 0020-0024]; Maynard: [abstract; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60]).

With regarding **claim 11**, He discloses a storage medium readable by a computer system, the storage medium encoding a computer program that when executed on [the computer system causes the computer system to perform a computer process, the computer process comprising:

requesting identification of a first object in association with a capture of an image (Fig. 2; RFID block; abstract; [0010-0011; 0027-0029; 0032-0033);

the requesting made over at least two channels, including a channel adapted for use by a cell phone and a channel adapted for use by a laptop computer ([0028-0029; 0031]);

receiving a first identifier, responsive to the requesting operation, the first identifier identifying the first object in the image ([0029-0033]).

However, He fails to explicitly disclose selecting, based on the first identifier, a sub-portion of a library of potential matches.

identifying a second object that is shown in the image separately from the first object using the sub-portion of the potential matches, the second object being identified by a second identifier that is different from the first identifier.

In the same field of endeavor, Maynard teaches an RFID tagging system having RFID tag that can be program to write different sets of data thereto Col. 1, Ln. 50-51). The RFID or transponder tag includes a first storage area for storing a first set of data uniquely identifying the transponder tag and a second storage area for storing a second set of data describing an asset and components within said asset (Fig. 3; see tag data and asset data; abstract; Col. 1, Ln. 53-57; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60; Col. 6, Ln. 21-Col. 7, Ln. 10). Maynard further teaches computer network assets include processor, workstation, monitors, printers, scanners, network servers and the components include hard drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems, and all other equipments which can be sold within or added to a network asset (Col. 1, Ln. 59-65: Therefore, sold/ added equipments or components such that external hard drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems are encompassed by Maynard reference). Maynard further suggested

that the printers, and scanners of such kinds of assets can also be supplied with transponder tags and EEPROM's (Col. 6, Ln. 40-41; sold/ added equipments or components and printers, scanners are inherently separated from computer network asset shown in Fig. 1). In light of the teaching from Maynard, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of He to include a second storage in an RFID tag in order to store information describing a plurality of external components such that external drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems and/or any other equipments and thus allow He's device to further select one of the plurality of data described in the second storage area of the RFID to identify other external components or sold/ added equipments (second object) that are attached to a computer network asset (first object). The modifications not only allow a single RFID tag to store information of all other objects/ external components or added/sold equipments that are added to a first object (computer network asset), but also allow the device to further identify all other objects/ external components or added/sold equipments surrounding a computer network asset.

He as modified by Maynard teaches wherein the sub-portion is less than the library of potential matches (The limitation is broadly written and confused. Therefore, the examiner broadly interpreted this limitation as if searching by the sub-portion is less time than by searching for a whole library of potential matches. Col. 1, Ln. 53-65; Col. 6, Ln. 21-Col. 7, Ln. 10: Maynard teaches a second storage of the tag for describing the asset and its components or equipments. [0024]: He teaches to determine if the image data generated by the imaging engine corresponds with stored image data associated

with the read RFID code. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the device o He to only limit a search to only images data associated with read RFID code including in a first and second storage RFID tag area of Maynard in order to reduce search time),

wherein the sub-portion of the library includes a hierarchy of models, the hierarchy of models including a base model to roughly identify an object and specialized models to refine the rough identification ([0052-0053]: He teaches that the stored image data 605 preferably includes one or more image entries 606 such that an entry of each side, view, face, front, back of the object and that these image entries 606 may include addition data indicative of object dimension, text identifying the object, face of the object and extractions or derivation data derived or extracted from the actual image data. Therefore, the base model is interpreted as one of the image entries of a particular side and the specialized models are interpreted as all other remained image entries and addition data indicative of object).

With regarding **claim 12**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 2. Therefore, claim 12 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 2. However, claim 12 further requires a storage medium (He: 0039).

With regarding **claim 13**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 3. Therefore, claim 13 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 3. However, claim 13 further requires a storage medium (He: 0039).

With regarding **claim 14**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 4. Therefore, claim 14 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 4. However, claim 14 further requires a storage medium (He: 0039).

With regarding **claim 15**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 5. Therefore, claim 15 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 5. However, claim 15 further requires a storage medium (He: 0039).

With regarding **claim 16**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 6. Therefore, claim 16 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 6. However, claim 16 further requires a storage medium (He: 0039).

With regarding **claim 20**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 10. Therefore, claim 20 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 10. However, claim 20 further requires a storage medium (He: 0039).

With regarding **claim 21**, He discloses a system comprising:

a processor (Fig. 3; CPU 302 and/or micro controller 304);

a memory coupled to the processor ([0039]);

a signaling module (Fig. 2; RFID block) coupled to a digital capture device (imaging engine 14) requesting identification a first object in association with a capture of an image (abstract; [0010-0011; 0027-0029; 0032-0033]); the signaling module

further receiving an identifier identifying the first object in the image, responsive to requesting identification ([0029-0033]).

However, He fails to explicitly disclose an identifying module configured to select, based on the first identifier, a sub-portion of a library of potential matches, and to identify a second object that shown in the image using the selected sub-portion of potential matches, the second object being identified by a second identifier that is different from the first identifier.

In the same field of endeavor, Maynard teaches an RFID tagging system having RFID tag that can be program to write different sets of data thereto Col. 1, Ln. 50-51). The RFID or transponder tag includes a first storage area for storing a first set of data uniquely identifying the transponder tag and a second storage area for storing a second set of data describing an asset and components within said asset (Fig. 3; see tag data and asset data; abstract; Col. 1, Ln. 53-57; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60; Col. 6, Ln. 21-Col. 7, Ln. 10). Maynard further teaches computer network assets include processor, workstation, monitors, printers, scanners, network servers and the components include hard drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems, and all other equipments which can be sold within or added to a network asset (Col. 1, Ln. 59-65: Therefore, sold/ added equipments or components such that external hard drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems are encompassed by Maynard reference). Maynard further suggested that the printers, and scanners of such kinds of assets can also be supplied with transponder tags and EEPROM's (Col. 6, Ln. 40-41; sold/ added equipments or components and printers, scanners are inherently separated from computer network

asset shown in Fig. 1). In light of the teaching from Maynard, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of He to include a second storage in an RFID tag in order to store information describing a plurality of external components such that external drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems and/or any other equipments and thus allow He's device to further select one of the plurality of data described in the second storage area of the RFID to identify other external components or sold/ added equipments (second object) that are attached to a computer network asset (first object). The modifications not only allow a single RFID tag to store information of all other objects/ external components or added/sold equipments that are added to a first object (computer network asset), but also allow the device to further identify all other objects/ external components or added/sold equipments surrounding a computer network asset.

He as modified by Maynard teaches the sub-portion of the library includes a hierarchy of models, the hierarchy of models including a base model to roughly identify an object and specialized models to refine the rough identification ([0052-0053]: He teaches that the stored image data 605 preferably includes one or more image entries 606 such that an entry of each side, view, face, front, back of the object and that these image entries 606 may include addition data indicative of object dimension, text identifying the object, face of the object and extractions or derivation data derived or extracted from the actual image data. Therefore, the base model is interpreted as one of the image entries of a particular side and the specialized models are interpreted as all

other remained image entries and addition data indicative of object), the sub-portion being is less than the library of potential matches (The limitation is broadly written and confused. Therefore, the examiner broadly interpreted this limitation as if searching by the sub-portion is less time than by searching for a whole library of potential matches. Col. 1, Ln. 53-65; Col. 6, Ln. 21-Col. 7, Ln. 10: Maynard teaches a second storage of the tag for describing the asset and its components or equipments. [0024]: He teaches to determine if the image data generated by the imaging engine corresponds with stored image data associated with the read RFID code. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the device o He to only limit a search to only images data associated with read RFID code including in a first and second storage RFID tag area of Maynard in order to reduce search time).

With regarding **claim 22**, He discloses the system of claim 21 wherein at least one of the objects is an active object, and the identifier of the active object is received from the active object (abstract; [0029-0033]: object inherently active in order for the RFID block to activate the object for receiving RFID signals; Maynard: [abstract; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60]).

With regarding **claim 23**, He discloses the system of claim 21 wherein at least one of the objects is a delegate object, and wherein the identifier of the delegate object is received from another object (abstract; [0005-0007]; Maynard: Fig. 3: see tag data and asset data ; [abstract; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60]).

With regarding **claim 24**, He discloses the system of claim 21 further comprising: an image capture module capturing the image (Figs. 2-3; imaging 14).

With regarding **claim 25**, He discloses the system of claim 21 further comprising: a registration module associating the identifier with the image ([0005-0008; 0020-0024]).

With regarding **claim 26**, He discloses the system of claim 21 further comprising: a model extractor extracting a model associated with the identifier from a model library (Fig. 6; extract data module 616 and/or comparator module 608; abstract; [0056-0058]; Maynard: [abstract; Col. 4, Ln. 1-41).

With regarding **claim 27**, He discloses the system of claim 21 further comprising: a model extractor extracting a model associated with the identifier from a model library (Fig. 6; extract data module 616 and/or comparator module 608; abstract; [0056-0058]; Maynard: [abstract; Col. 4, Ln. 42-60]); and

an object matching module evaluating the image using the model to determine whether the object is in the image (face detection module 612 and/or comparator module 608; abstract; [0056-0058]).

With regarding **claim 30**, He discloses the system of claim 21 further comprising: an image storage module associatively storing with the image one or more parameters relating to the object identified in the image ([0005-0008; 0020-0024]).

With regarding **claim 37**, He discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein the first object does not identify the second object ([0049-0062]): He references encompass the limitations because the mystery object image and the wrong RFID tag code can not be used to identify the second object from the first object) and wherein the selected sub-portion of potential matches refers to objects that are not components of the first object (Col. 1, Ln. 59-65: Maynard further teaches components include hard drives, floppy drives, CD ROM drives, modems, and all other equipments which can be sold within or added to a network asset).

With regarding **claim 38**, He discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the library of potential matches comprises visual image models, and the identifying the second object comprises comparing the visual image models with the captured image to identify the second object (He also suggest various verifications processing by comparing captured image with stored image data including each side, view face, front and/or back and by the face determination module and extract data module in order to determine a potential match; He: abstract; [0050-0060]; Maynard: Col. 1, Ln. 53-65; Col. 6, Ln. 21-Col. 7, Ln. 10: Maynard teaches a second storage of the tag for describing the asset and its components or equipments).

With regarding **claim 39**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 37. Therefore, claim 39 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 37. However, claim 39 further requires a storage medium (He: 0039).

With regarding **claim 40**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 38. Therefore, claim 40 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 38. However, claim 39 further requires a storage medium (He: 0039).

With regarding **claim 41**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 37. Therefore, claim 41 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 37.

With regarding **claim 42**, the claim contains the same limitations as claimed in claim 38. Therefore, claim 42 is analyzed and rejected as discussed under claim 38.

With regarding claim 51, He discloses the method of claim 1, wherein a first channel of the at least two channels is adapted for use by a cell phone and a second channel of the at least two channels is adapted for use by a laptop computer ([0028-0029; 0031]).

7. Claims 44 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over He in view of Stilp (US-2004/0,212493).

With regarding claim 44, He discloses the method of claim 43, wherein the image is a video image ([0038]). However, He fails to disclose wherein the transmitting of the request is performed in response to a significant scene change in the image.

In an analogous art, Stilp teaches an RFID reader for detecting motion where the RFID reader can contain an audio transducer, a camera, or various environment sensors to detect other parameters (abstract). In light of the teaching from Stilp, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of He to further tranceive RFID signal when motion is detected. The modifications thus provide a more versatile scanner system.

With regarding claim 50, He discloses the method of claim 49, wherein the image is a video image ([0038]). However, He fails to disclose wherein the transmitting of the request is in response to a significant scene change in the image.

In an analogous art, Stilp teaches an RFID reader for detecting motion where the RFID reader can contain an audio transducer, a camera, or various environment sensors to detect other parameters (abstract). In light of the teaching from Stilp, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify the device of He to further transceive RFID signal when motion is detected. The modifications thus provide a more versatile scanner system.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG H. LAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7367. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SINH TRAN can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung H Lam/
Examiner, Art Unit 2622
02/14/11